

FREEDOM LEAGUE

She refuses \$60 refund; IRS fines her

By Rod Speer
The Register



Linda Kelsey
'It's ridiculous'

HUNTINGTON BEACH — All Linda Kelsey had to do was sign the tax form on the bottom line, and the Internal Revenue Service would have sent her a \$60 tax refund.

But she declined, she said, to give Uncle Sam a break.

Instead of a refund or a pat on the back, she got a letter from the IRS saying she now owed \$77 as a penalty for not turning in her forms.

She was appalled.

"It's ridiculous," Kelsey said. "How could they fine me for not accepting a \$60 overpayment?"

If the IRS appears to be bungling, perhaps it's no wonder. Kelsey and her husband, John, have not filed income tax forms since 1979. The Huntington Beach residents have been members of tax-protesting organizations for about three years.

A special IRS collection department for those not filing tax forms tried to determine her tax liability without her help.

The department figured her 1979 income as \$11,754 from her job then as an assembler (she is now unemployed), and based on the withholding taxes she paid, told her in a letter last October that she was due the \$60.

"I didn't want it," Kelsey said. "I figured out of the thousands of dollars we paid in, I felt they (the government) needed it more than we did."

But she conceded that not responding to the refund notice was also a means of continuing her tax protest.

HERE'S THE WHOLE STORY

In October, 1982 Linda received a letter from the IRS that they had computed her tax (since she hadn't filed) and they figured that she had made an overpayment of 60 FRNs. They wanted her to sign the form agreeing to the amount and then they would send her the 60 FRNs. As the story indicates, she felt they needed the money more than she and her husband, John, so she ignored the letter. By the way, there were no indications on the IRS form that any penalties would be charged if she did not return the form.

In March of 1983 Linda received a second letter. This time the letter came from the IRS employee Linda Cuneo. The letter basically said the same thing as the first except this time the IRS added that if Linda did not return the form they would have no other choice but to send a **NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY!!** Since this letter also did not mention that any penalties would be charged if she did not return the form....she didn't.

(continued on next page)

"It is indeed a tribute to the resourcefulness of politicians who, in devising a variety of taxes and methods for disguising and collecting them, have been able to con the average American into parting with so much of his productive effort."

IRWIN A. SCHIFF

HAPPY

1983

HOLIDAYS

1984

DON'T FORGET
WE'VE MOVED

2140 W. CHAPMAN
SUITE 223
ORANGE, CALIFORNIA 92668
(714) 385 - 1776

PLEASE CHANGE YOUR RECORDS

DECEMBER SCHEDULE
ON PAGES 26/27

FREEDOM LEAGUE
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
Ronald W. Matheson, Executive Director
2140 WEST CHAPMAN
SUITE 223
ORANGE, CALIFORNIA 92668
(714) 385-1776

FIRST-CLASS MAIL U. S. Postage PAID Orange, CA Permit No. 1305

REFUND

FROM A1

To sign the documents would have acknowledged that the government made a correct accounting of her financial status that year. She said the accounting was correct — even though her tax filing status is listed as single and only one exemption is listed, when she had two daughters living at home then.

She is a former member of a Garden Grove-based tax-protest group, Your Heritage Protection Association, that contends income taxes are unlawful and advocates not responding to IRS inquiries.

The couple now belong to the Orange-based Freedom League,

which contends that paying income taxes is voluntary. The Kelseys prefer not to pay taxes unless forced to do so, such as through employer withholding, she said.

Tax auditor Linda Cuneo of the IRS' El Monte office said that if Kelsey were eligible for a refund, the \$77 penalty assessment should not have been made. "It could have been just an error," Cuneo said.

She said the special IRS department works with a very limited knowledge of a taxpayer's liability, because the taxpayer files no documents. "We're just trying to determine what's right and what's not," she said.

As for the \$60, Cuneo said such uncollected refunds are applied against a taxpayer's future tax payments.

INSIDERS

BEHIND THE SCENES IN THE WORLD OF BUSINESS

Snubbing a refund earns IRS penalty

The Internal Revenue Service has fined a Huntington Beach, Calif., woman \$77 for refusing a \$60 IRS refund check.

The IRS figured Linda Kelsey's 1979 taxes based on her salary withholding because, as a member of the Freedom League, a group that believes paying income taxes is voluntary, she has refused to file returns since that year. Then the agency sent a form informing her that she was due \$60.

Thinking that the government wanted the money more than she and her husband, John, did, Kelsey didn't mail in the form to receive the refund. "We paid them thousands before, so we figured they needed it a hell of a lot more than we did," she said Tuesday.

Later, Kelsey received an-

other IRS letter slapping her with a \$77 "negligent penalty" for not sending in the form.

"It's ridiculous. How could they fine me for not accepting a \$60 overpayment?" Kelsey said.

"It could have been just an error," because the penalty shouldn't be assessed in cases in which no taxes are owed, said IRS tax auditor Linda Cuneo in El Monte, Calif. "We're just trying to determine what's right and what's not," she said.

The \$60 normally would be applied to Kelsey's future taxes, Cuneo said.

Kelsey prefers not to be called a tax protester but rather "a patriot," she says. "As far as I'm concerned, all taxes are voluntary and I don't feel like volunteering."



Then in July of 1983 Linda received the NOTICE OF DEFICIENCY. In this NOTICE the IRS said that they not only had disregarded her 60 FRN overpayment, but that they were also charging her with a 77 FRN penalty for UNDERPAYMENT!! Can you believe that? In September Linda and John came to us with the problem and we felt that this was a good case for tax court. But first we felt we should notify Mr. Egger and Linda Cuneo about this strange circumstance....thus the letter on page three. After reading the letter and reviewing her papers again, we realized that this was a very funny story and the press needed to see it. Our media director, Patrick Detches, took the material to the honorable Orange County paper THE REGISTER and you see the results.

The day after the article appeared in THE REGISTER the story was in USA TODAY. Then Linda started to receive phone calls from all over the country for interviews....radio stations....newspapers....fellow patriots....and even today Linda still has radio interviews scheduled into December. Such a lot of fun from such a small incident.

Of course, what the IRS is attempting to do is to lure unsuspecting individuals into signing and returning the form...then you can bet that the next step will be the audit! What makes us laugh is that the IRS is only offering 60 FRNs.....why not 1,000? COME ON FELLAS...MAKE THE GAME WORTH FIGHTING FOR!

By the way, as of this date, Linda has not heard back from Egger or Cuneo. However she does plan on calling Cuneo before we petition Tax Court. WE WANT MORE PUBLICITY!

Roscoe L. Egger, Jr., Commissioner
Internal Revenue Service
P.O. Box 231
Los Angeles, California 90053

Dear Mr. Egger:

First of all, I find it interesting that your name appears on the enclosed 90 day letter. I thought that Mr. Connnett was the District Director for our area. Has he quit? Is he refusing to take the responsibility for some of these weird actions by your agents?

As for the reason for this letter. For many years I thought that the so-called 'horror stories' about the IRS were not true. Now it appears that they are true. It also appears that the agents who work for you do not have a capability of using common sense.

Please review the enclosed documentation. All of the documents are going to be interesting to the politicians and newspapers that review them. First of all....in October of 1982 I received a letter from Phil Grimes (over the stamped signature of W.H. Connnett) that said I had made an overpayment of \$60.

I didn't respond because I felt that the government could use it to help reduce the annual deficit. You will notice that Mr. Grimes letter did not state that I could be subject to penalties for not responding.

So I was very much surprised when I received the letter from Linda Cuneo stating that I was going to be sent a statutory notice of deficiency if I didn't return the signed form asking for the \$60 to be sent to me. **How can there be a deficiency on my part if you are the one who owes me the money?** I was amazed at this statement. It didn't make any sense at all. All the IRS was asking was that I sign some form and send it back so that they could send me the \$60. I didn't want the \$60. so I didn't respond. **WHAT WAS WRONG WITH THAT?** This letter from Linda also did not state anything more about possible penalties for not responding....WHY NOT?

Then the kicker....the **BELIEVE IT OR NOT** action by the IRS. On June 23, 1983 I received the enclosed 90 day letter which not only disallowed my \$60. overpayment but also included a penalty for negligence. What negligence? Was it negligent to give \$60. extra to the government? Was it negligent not to answer the previous letters that didn't state anything about penalties for not answering? Even the IRS's notices regarding penalties only state that penalties will be charged for late payment and late filing. **I certainly was not late in payment...I overpaid what was due.... AND YOUR AGENTS SAID SO!!**

Now please look at the statement made by your agent..."THE UNDERPAYMENT OF TAX IS DUE TO NEGLIGENCE OR INTENTIONAL DISREGARD OF RULES....ETC" WHAT UNDERPAYMENT IS HE/SHE TALKING ABOUT? I OVERPAID!

Your agent says that the penalty is provided for in Section 6653(a) of the infamous Internal Revenue Code. I have read that Section and it is titled...FAILURE TO PAY TAX. **I DID NOT FAIL TO PAY TAX....I PAID TOO MUCH....WHERE IS THAT PENALTY PROVIDED FOR?** The Section also talks about PENALTIES FOR UNDERPAYMENT....WHERE AND WHEN DID I UNDERPAY?

This whole action is absolutely ridiculous. How can anyone with any sanity or common sense end up with this kind of determination? When are you turkeys going to wake up before you go to work?

As a law-abiding citizen who overpays her taxes, I hereby **DEMAND** that you withdraw this action **IMMEDIATELY!**

Sincerely, 3

The economy

Rbscoe L. Egger Jr., the chief of the Internal Revenue Service said that voluntary payment of federal income taxes may suffer if Congress insists on using the IRS as a debt-collection agency. The IRS already is required to withhold tax refunds from parents who are behind in making child-support payments and whose spouses receive welfare. Congress now is considering a bill requiring the IRS to withhold tax refunds from people who have defaulted on federal student loans.

DAVIS -- Today's college students won glowing remarks from a University of California researcher who calls them a "new kind of student" who will make positive changes in society.

The students are more serious, trusting, self-confident and religious, better organized and more career-minded than students of the 1960s, according to Mary Regan, a behavioral scientist at the University of California.

In a study of personality and academic differences between two generations of campus undergraduates, she also found that students are less spontaneous and impulsive, less likely to question authority and less creative than students of 20 years ago.

Tax load: We pay more, companies less

Special for USA TODAY

USA corporations are carrying less of the federal tax load, while individuals are shouldering more, a new congressional study said Monday.

Corporate income taxes accounted for 8.1 percent of federal revenues in 1982, while personal income taxes ac-

counted for 49 percent, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the General Accounting Office study said.

In 1950, corporations paid 28.3 percent of federal revenues; personal income contributions were 39.2 percent. Contributions for Social Security and other social insurance programs rose from 11.2 percent

to 34.7 percent.

Economic recovery is expected to raise the corporate tax share, said Tax Foundation Inc. research director Elsie Walters. However, Walters said 1988 projections show individuals still bearing 46 percent of the burden compared to 11 percent for business.

The study found:

■ 7 of 29 major industries paid less than 10 percent of their income in taxes last year — a rate below that faced by the average USA worker.

■ The average firm paid 16.1 percent of its USA earnings to the federal government.

■ Industries with "negative" taxes — which received money back from the government

through a combination of depressed earnings or losses and accumulated tax credits — were: chemicals, 17.7 percent; insurance, 6.3; financial institutions, 3.8 and aerospace, 0.6.

"The tax system has become a punchboard of gimmicks," said Rep. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., who was one of those requesting the study.

ARMED CONFLICT

by: MARTIN LARSON
REPRINTED FROM
THE SPOTLIGHT

In a "manual supplement" dated January 10, 1979, for its employees, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) declared:

"Since some illegal tax-protesters advocate violence in dealing with Service personnel, Revenue Officers should attempt to secure payments and returns without personally contacting the protestor outside the office. If personal contact is necessary outside the office, the Revenue Officer should consider being accompanied by an armed escort."

There you have it! The IRS admits to its own personnel that it has come to an armed conflict with the people.

The extent and the very fact of such violence was long concealed from the general public; but we have now been apprised officially of its existence.

In September, 1980, Alan Stang published an article called "Due Process" in which he told how Don McGrath was shot to death by IRS agents in North Dakota in a dispute over a bill of \$39.65.

When the shootout with Gordon Kahl occurred, such violence became national news, and even more so when he was killed in Arkansas.

At any rate, the IRS now officially admits that violence between taxpayers and IRS agents is becoming more frequent and severe. The United Press International, in a syndicated article dated in Washington, declared that: "Tax-protestors are assaulting Internal Revenue Service agents more frequently; and in one case a contract was put out to kill an IRS employee. IRS Commis-

sioner Roscoe Egger says."

Examples are plentiful: an IRS employee was shot in Cleveland; the types of harassment range from late-night telephone calls to physical threats and actual violence. In 1982, no fewer than 512 verified incidents concerned IRS employees threatened with physical violence or actually attacked—an increase of 60 over the previous year.

Over the past seven years, 3,647 cases of threats or assaults have been investigated by the Security Division of the agency. Egger emphasized in testimony before a Senate subcommittee that while this kind of thing has been going on for years, it has, of late, increased rapidly in frequency and seriousness.

In addition to this, an increasing number of IRS employees are being sued personally for violation of civil rights. Egger demanded that in all cases—no matter what the facts might be—the government itself, i.e. the taxpayers, should be the defendants. He stated that 1,361 civil suits against employees were pending in 1983. Taxpayers and protesters have also filed a multitude of liens against real estate owned by IRS personnel.

The Coeur d'Alene (Idaho) "Press" stated in an article published May 27, 1983, that three taxpayers had filed suits totaling \$8 million against seven IRS employees and the father of one of them.

All this is a symptom of the war the federal government is waging, through the IRS, against its own people, who, driven to the extremities of desperation, are reacting as human beings have al-

ways done under intolerable stress and extortion.

I predict that the IRS is riding for a great fall; and I can tell you how its collapse could come quickly, certainly, and without even a bloody nose:

(1) Let all employees report enough allowances to eliminate withholding and then make no returns at all; and

(2) Even more decisive and strategic, let all the 25 million self-employed simply stop filing any return for a single year!

That would signal the immediate end and collapse of the IRS!




HERE IS ONE PLACE THOSE TAXES GO!

"I LOVE NEW YORK SUMMER FEEDING PROGRAM" SAMPLE MENU

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY
	Zesty "Coney Island Chicken Frankfurter" on Whole Wheat Roll Sweet Potato Knish Mixed Fruit Milk - Low Fat or Whole	"Special Cheese Pizza" Tossed Green Salad w/Carrot Iced Watermelon Wedge Peanut Butter & Jelly Bar Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Chilled Apple Juice Hot Meat Ball Hero Creamy Cole Slaw Oatmeal Raisin Cookies Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Savory Fish & Cheese Portion on Sesame Bun Tartar Sauce Corn-on-the-cob-Butter Fresh Peach Milk - Low Fat or Whole
Pineapple Juice "Super Shells" (Stuffed Shells w/Cheese & Tomato Sauce) Crunchy Vegetable Chips Ice Cream Whole Wheat Bread/Butter Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Tuna Salad Hero - w/Lettuce Fresh Potato Salad Frosted Fruit Pop Milk - Low Fat or Whole	"Summer Burger" (Burger on Sesame Bun) w/sliced Tomatoes Crispy French Fried Potatoes Fresh Nectarine Milk - Low Fat or Whole	"Golden Chicken Littles w/special sauce Corn-on-the-cob-Butter Whole Bread Iced Watermelon Slice Milk - Low Fat or Whole	"Pizza Boat" (French Bread) Tossed Salad w Red Cabbage Fresh Plums Raisins Milk - Low Fat or Whole
Batter Dip Fish Hero Roll Cole Slaw Fresh Nectarine Oatmeal Raisin Cookies Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Broiled Beef Patty on Sesame Bun Crisp Potato Nuggets Pineapple Tidbits Ice Cream Cup Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Pizza Roll Summer Vegetable Salad Iced Watermelon Slice Raisins Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Beef Turnover Corn Medley Frosted Fruit Juice Bar Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Oven Crispy Chicken Whole Wheat Bread/Butter "Pop-Eye" French Pie Applesauce Milk - Low Fat or Whole
Beef Patty on Sesame Bun Golden French Fried Potatoes Frozen Fruit Juice Ice Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Zesty "Coney Island Chicken Frankfurter" on Whole Wheat Roll Sweet Potato Knish Apricots Milk - Low Fat or Whole	"Special Cheese Pizza" Tossed Green Salad w/Carrot Iced Watermelon Wedge Peanut Butter & Jelly Bar Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Chilled Apple Juice Hot Meat Ball Hero Creamy Cole Slaw Oatmeal Raisin Cookies Milk - Low Fat or Whole	Savory Fish & Cheese Portion on Sesame Bun Tartar Sauce Corn-on-the-cob-Butter Milk - Low Fat or Whole

*May be subject to change

LOOK HOW WELL DRESSED THEY ARE!







Esta hoja imprimida y distribuida cortesia del Local 372, NYC Board of Education Employees,
District Council 37, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, 125 Barclay Street, New York N.Y.
Charles Hughes, President; Tom Jennings, Division Director.

THIS IS A PAGE FROM A BOOK CALLED "THE STORY OF MONEY"

by: FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK
33 LIBERTY STREET NEW YORK 10045



TODAY, MOST COIN AND CURRENCY IS "FIAT" MONEY--MONEY BY VIRTUE OF GOVERNMENT DECLARATION AND PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE. FIAT MONEY ISN'T VALUABLE IN ITSELF AND DOESN'T REPRESENT A CLAIM ON GOLD OR SILVER.



A COUNTY ATTORNEY SPEAKS OUT ON ARTICLE I, SECTION 10

TUPPER SAUSSY HAS DONE IT AGAIN!!

The **MAIN STREET JOURNAL HAS DONE IT AGAIN!!** And a reminder....if you are not a subscriber become one now. I have always said that Tupper's **THE MIRACLE ON MAIN STREET** and Irwin's **HOW ANYONE CAN STOP PAYING INCOME TAXES** are the old and new Testaments to our movement....and Tupper's **JOURNAL** is **MUST** reading for those who want to know what is going on around the country as regards Article 1, Section 10. Tupper opened the door to our battle with States with the Hagar decision... and it was first properly exposed in MOMS. And now Tupper has been able to obtain assistance from Guy Curtis in furthering the educational process of our state officials. Guy is from Imperial, Nebraska and has served as his county's duly-elected attorney/prosecutor **FOR OVER 22 YEARS!**

Recently, at the National Commodity and Barter Association's national convention, I had the opportunity to meet and converse with Guy....and he is refreshing. He brings a new dimension to our fight, and he has taken the step to **STAND UP AND BE COUNTED.** During this covention, Guy also met with Tupper and Ken Bush, Tupper's third arm and erstwhile Health Food Restaurant critic, and, while Ken had the cameras rolling, Tupper asked Guy, "As county attorney would you prosecute anyone who asserted his money rights secured by Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution?"

And Guy said, "**Absolutely not. Absolutely not.** Following my own conscience, it is my primary duty not to violate the Constitution. This is a higher commandment than the state statutes and the federal statutes if they're in violation of Article 1, Section 10. So, in Chase County, Nebraska, I would follow the Constitution."

Guy Curtis was soon to express his conscience in an important piece of writing. When Colorado Miracle-Worker John Walburn was told by his state attorney general to seek advice on the practical meaning of Article 1, Section 10 from a private attorney, Walburn did so. He sought advice from the law firm of Curtis and Curtis, of Imperial, Nebraska.

Guy Curtis wrote and signed the opinion, which is "applicable to any state including Colorado"....and here is his letter:

Mr. John E. Walburn
1599 Aspen Street
Broomfield, Colorado 80020

Re: Article I, Section 10
U.S. Constitution

Dear Jack:

My opinion to your inquiry regarding the payment of your tax debt to Boulder County, a subdivision of the State of Colorado, is applicable to any state including Colorado.

Article I, Section 10 requires the State of Colorado to denominate your tax debt in gold or silver coin.

Unless and until the state authority denominates your tax debt in gold or silver coin, you are legally immune from such tax, since any assessment repugnant to Article I, Section 10 is absolutely void. (16 Am Jur 2nd. 82).

The stereotyped response by the state attorney general is to cite the federal legal tender law and peremptorily claim that it overrides the state's obligation under Article I, Section 10. That this "supremacy" argument is spurious is proved by the fact that the mandate of Article I, Section 10 comes from the U. S. Constitution itself and is the supreme law of the land. The feds can insure their fiat paper money decree for payment of debts between individuals and for payment of federal taxes and debts, but not between states and their citizens.

Yours very truly,

Guy Curtis
County Attorney

Even though Guy is a very busy attorney and is handling several cases for the N.C.B.A., he told me that he would be willing to send a similar letter to anyone who wishes to have a copy and who would feel that it would be of some help in his or her state. I feel that this is great for Guy to extend his time to do this for all of us. However, I do not believe that we should expect Guy to be able to do this without some compensation for the time involved in handling the mail and answering letters....so, if you would like a similar letter, write to Guy at: Curtis and Curtis, 610 Broadway, Imperial, Nebraska 69033. AND PLEASE ENCLOSE A CONTRIBUTION FOR HIS TIME AND EXPENSES....SUGGESTED MINIMUM IS 10 FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES.

AND DON'T FORGET TO SUBSCRIBE TO THE MAIN STREET JOURNAL, C/O SPENCER JUDD PUBLISHERS, P.O. BOX 143, SEWANEE, TENNESSEE 37375. THE SUBSCRIPTION IS ONLY 36 FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES A YEAR.

ATTENTION!! SPECIAL MEETINGS

DON'T FORGET THESE SPECIAL MEETINGS IN NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER:

- NOVEMBER 29 - TUESDAY - FLOYD WRIGHT, AUTHOR OF **"BEAT THE IRS? I DID!"**
WHERE? - HILTON AT THE PARK HOTEL 7:30 PM
10 FRNS PER PERSON OR COUPLE
- DECEMBER 3 - SATURDAY - JOHN PLEASANT - WORKSHOP ON **COURTROOM PROCEDURES** *
WHERE? - LEAGUE HEADQUARTERS 9:30 AM
125 FRNS PER PERSON
- DECEMBER 5 MONDAY - LEE BROBST - **JURISDICTION AND MARITIME LAW** *
WHERE? - LEAGUE HEADQUARTERS 7:30 PM
- DECEMBER 10 SATURDAY - CYRIL STEVENSON - **AT LAW** *
WHERE? - LEAGUE HEADQUARTERS 9:30 AM
15 FRNS PER PERSON * **RESERVATIONS REQUIRED**

THE ALAN STANG REPORT

Tape 596, Week of October 17, 1983

More Flight Seven Questions
False Red Radio Signals
More Soviet Confusion
Assassination Plan
Chad

Tape 596, No. 1

More Flight Seven Questions

This is Alan Stang. More questions about Korean Air Lines Flight 7. Details in a minute. Please stick around.

Disturbing questions are emerging about the Soviet Assassination of Congressman Larry McDonald, and the murders of the other 268 people aboard Korean Air Lines Flight 7. The Review Of The News reports that a U.S. Navy Air-Sea Rescue mission set out from Honolulu for the crash site, to recover bodies, wreckage and evidence, but the State Department ordered it back to port. Who gave that order and why? The incident recalls the fact that when Communist North Korea seized the U.S. Navy Intelligence ship Pueblo, our military commanders sent forces to save it. They could have done so, but somebody up there in Washington called them back.

So, now, again, we ask: Who called them back? It is important to note that the crash site of Flight Seven was just outside Soviet territorial waters. Indeed, a group of former CIA officers has begun a private investigation of the massacre. The group includes pilots with many hours of flight time over the Sea of Japan. Their first conclusion is that Flight Seven was destroyed outside Soviet air space, in international waters.

The Review Of The News reports that Members of Congress asked Secretary of State George Shultz who gave the State Department order that called

the rescue mission back. He refused to answer, but said off the record: "A search in or near Soviet waters wasn't worth a war." Did the Soviet terrorists threaten to go to war over Korean Air Lines Flight 7, and did the United States blink, as usual?

There is also the curious fact that the National Security Agency knew Flight Seven had been destroyed before 3 p.m. on August 31st; NSA people who went off duty at 4 p.m. were surprised when the story did not appear on the network news that evening. Indeed, Washington didn't tell the people about the atrocity for more than eight hours. Why? Why did the State Department tell Dr. McDonald's family at 10 p.m., seven hours after the plane was destroyed, that it had landed safely on Sakhalin? Was the purpose of that lie to deter that rescue mission from Honolulu? As you can see, there is typically a lot about the incident Washington is withholding.

Along these lines, regular listeners will recall that a U.S. Air Force R.C.-135 electronic surveillance aircraft was in the general area at the time of the massacre, and routinely would have known what was happening from the minute Flight Seven went off course and the Soviet fighters started stalking it. I'll be back in a minute.

In our continuing coverage of the massacre, we have told you that we believe the Soviet terrorists deliberately lured Flight Seven off course by some electronic means, as part of a carefully orchestrated scheme to assassinate Dr. McDonald. New information about this probability now arrives. Be with me tomorrow for details.

This is Alan Stang. Think about it.

The Alan Stang Report is a daily five-minute radio news commentary. The broadcasts are written and narrated by Alan Stang, and are produced by Gail Atwood. Printed copies of Mr. Stang's commentaries are available at three copies for one dollar, or twenty copies for five dollars. Information on the availability of *The Stang Report* for broadcast in your area will be sent free of charge upon request.

Please address orders and inquiries to: The Alan Stang Report, Post Office Box 725, Alta Loma, California 91701 or call (714) 980-3165.

False Red Radio Signals

This is Alan Stang. How the Soviets could have lured Flight Seven off course. Details in a minute. Please stick around.

The network news has told you that the U.S. government maps used by aircraft flying in the Sea of Japan near Communist-occupied Russia bear the following statements: "Warning: Aircraft infringing on this territory may be fired upon without warning." The same network news made nothing of the fact that the same maps print another warning, in the same size type, and usually only a couple of inches away from the first one. Here it is: "Warning: Unlisted radio emissions from this area may constitute a navigation hazard, disrupt onboard navigation equipment, or result in border overflight."

The moguls of the media should have given this shocking information the spotlight. Instead, they buried it. Consider that if the experts who make such maps took the trouble to print that warning on them, it is reasonable to assume that Soviet navigational disruption is a genuine danger. Indeed, it is reasonable to assume that the Soviets had lured other aircraft into their territory by electronic means, before they destroyed Flight Seven.

How do they accomplish such a thing? Your reporter is not a military expert. Stephen V. Cole is. In a recent issue of The Review Of The News, he says as follows of a 747: "The computer system is constantly monitoring signals from ground stations that say, through electronic code, that, for example, 'I am Tokyo and I am 364 miles southwest of you.' There's no way to tell, of course, if the station saying that is really Tokyo or is instead Vladivostok. The Soviets are known to have used similar fake signals in several cases in the past. Some of these are intentional and aimed at specific aircraft; others are simply routing military transmissions or emissions that are a safety hazard."

A 747 is of course loaded with backup systems. How could they all be wrong at the same time? Stephen Cole says the simplest answer to this question

is that someone made it happen. "Any system that uses a magnet can be upset by electromagnetic pulses. Any computer can be 'bombed' by similar pulses. Any system that reads data from outside the aircraft can be fed false data by the same channels. Gyrocompasses are hard to affect, but the instruments that read the gyro are very vulnerable to outside interference."

So, again, the most reasonable theory about what happened to Flight Seven is that the Soviets deliberately lured it off course. It makes sense to believe that, in the total absence of any proof to the contrary. I'll be back in a minute.

Stephen Cole presents even more reason to believe that the Soviets lured Flight Seven off course. Isn't it interesting that the moguls of the media haven't even considered this very strong possibility? Be with me tomorrow, when we'll see what else military expert Stephen Cole has to say.

This is Alan Stang. Think about it.

Tape 596, No. 3

More Soviet Confusion

This is Alan Stang. What the Soviet terrorists probably did to Flight Seven. Details in a minute. Please stick around.

Yesterday, as you recall, we began to take another look at the strong possibility that the Soviet terrorists deliberately lured Flight Seven into their territory so they could shoot it down. In a recent issue of The Review Of The News, military expert Stephen Cole reminds us that stewardesses routinely tell passengers on airliners not to operate electronic games, because they will distort the navigation systems. Such toys emit milli-milliwatts of power. In contrast, ground stations can emit thousands or even millions of watts.

Even simpler, says Stephen Cole, a doctored computer tape could easily have been slipped on board. Or a sophisticated device could have been



put into the cargo hold to wreck or affect the navigation system. At this point in World War Three—the war we are in now—it is reasonable to assume that the Soviet terrorists have agents in such major airports as Anchorage, where Flight Seven left the United States. To assume anything else would be unreasonable.

Military expert Cole tells us this: "When the plane passed over Sakhalin, the pilot radioed to confirm his position as approaching the northern most island of Japan. This would normally be done only when the Tacan system, which reads data from ground stations, confirmed the data from the inertial system, which reads an onboard gyroscope. Both systems were, obviously, wrong; but both gave the same position. Ergo, something affected both systems—each of which operates independently and by different means and each of which has double backups—and made them give the same incorrect position."

This is crucial, friends. Let's repeat it. Flight Seven had two separate and independent navigational systems, each of which had two backup units. Both of those systems were wrong about where the plane was, but both gave the same wrong position. The odds against this happening by accident are infinitely greater than the odds against hitting the super jackpot in Las Vegas.

Stephen Cole says as follows: "This would tend to indicate that something made the plane go off course while over the Pacific and flying on the inertial system, whereupon some unknown ground station broadcast data to confirm the incorrect position. That would mean, of course, that the incident was planned and prepared well in advance." It was known well in advance that Dr. McDonald would fly to Seoul to participate in a celebration of the friendship between South Korea and the United States. I'll be back in a minute.

Time after time, the Soviets kill more people in Afghanistan in one day, than they killed on Flight Seven. So, why are Americans, and others, more shocked about Flight Seven than they are about Afghanistan? One reason certainly is that few Americans go to Afghanistan. Millions of Americans fly. Many fly to Japan.

This is Alan Stang. Think about it.

Tape 596, No. 4

Assassination Plan

This is Alan Stang. More about the latest Soviet assassination plan. Details in a minute. Please stick around.

Throughout this week, we have been looking at the latest revelations about the Soviet mass murders aboard Korean Air Lines Flight 7. We've seen that unless other proof is presented, the most reasonable speculation about what happened is that the Kremlin terrorists deliberately tricked the 747 into their air space by means of false navigational signals, which is a Soviet specialty. In a recent issue of The Review Of The News, military expert Stephen Cole shows that Soviet planning for the atrocity extended far beyond those false radio signals.

"A professional military officer did the actual killing. The plane was hit at high altitude, reducing the chance of survivors. It was shot down over water, so that there would be little recoverable wreckage. The water was ice-cold, so any survivors might have died of exposure before rescue craft could have arrived. Somebody leaked the story that the plane had landed in Sakhalin, to keep our rescue forces grounded. Also the aircraft was shot down by missiles, meaning mid-air explosion. If they had really thought it was a sa plane, they could have fired a burst of cannon shells through the airplane. That would not have shot it down, but would have gotten the pilots attention and insured that he would follow orders. The fact that fighters tailed the plane for over two hours could mean that they wanted to drop the plane into the one spot in the entire Pacific where the Soviet fleet is strongest and would have won any fight over the wreckage."

They went to all this trouble to get rid of their most dangerous enemy in Congress, Dr. Larry McDonald. Indeed, Dr. McDonald could well have been their most dangerous enemy in the United States. He was systematically exposing the massive scope of Soviet terrorist and espionage activities in our country.



As this broadcast goes to press, the Reagan Administration has still done nothing, nothing but shout meaningless words; meaningless precisely because the President has done nothing. Perhaps the most important thing that needs to be said about this is the fact that the President's policy is the one most likely—most likely—to lead to war. Isn't that the lesson the world was supposed to have learned at Munich in 1938? You do not appease dictators. If you do appease dictators, you thereby whet their appetites for more aggression.

For years after Munich, the moguls of the media told us this was the lesson we must never forget. President Reagan has forgotten it, and buried it. I'll be back in a minute.

After Munich the word appeasement became something of an epithet, a word you almost couldn't say with ladies present. Chamberlain appeased Socialist dictator Hitler and provoked World War Two. Reagan appeases Socialist dictator Andropov, thereby encouraging him to invade still more countries, and shoot down more planes.

This is Alan Stang. Think about it.

Tape 596, No. 5

Chad

This is Alan Stang. A look at Hissen Habré, the man the U.S. is backing in Chad. Details in a minute. Please stick around.

In recent months, the endless war in the African nation of Chad has again flared up. The United States is backing President Hissen Habré, but the national press has told us little about him. Your reporter is guessing that you will be interested in a brief rendition of Chadian history. In 1960, Chad got its independence from France. Francois Tombalbaye became the first President. Monsieur Tombalbaye once sewed a missionary up in a drum and let him starve to death.

Meanwhile, French do-gooders sent a young man named Hissen Habré to Paris for an education. Hahré

learned Communism according to Red Chinese dictator Mao Tse-tung. He returned to Chad and established his own private army, waiting for the day when he could seize the country.

In a recent issue of The Review Of The News foreign correspondent Hilaire Du Berrier wrote as follows: "On April 21, 1974, Hissen Habré kidnapped a West German doctor, the doctor's wife, and a French archeologist named Francoise Claustre. Bonn managed to secure the release of the doctor, but his wife was kept captive. For the release of Madame Claustre, Habré demanded cash and 80 tons of ammunition from his former French benefactors. Paris refused the arms but gave Habré \$880,000 in francs and \$1.4 million in non-military goods supposedly to help establish a hospital. Hissen Habré accepted the gratuities but then refused to free his victim. Major Pierre Galpin, who had befriended Habré in the past, went to his hideout to negotiate for the woman's release. Habré slashed the Major's stomach open and tied him to the hind legs of a camel. The doctor's wife was also killed."

On April 3, 1975, a group of officers assassinated President Tombalbaye, and replaced him with General Felix Malloum. Hissen Habré and a man named Goukouni Oueddei joined forces long enough to launch a bloody massacre that drove Malloum out of the country. Oueddei became president, and signed an agreement with Soviet-sponsored Colonel Qaddafi of Libya. Qaddafi, who had sent troops to Chad, withdrew them, and Habré in turn overthrew Goukouni Oueddei. Now, Libyan tanks are rolling again and Oueddei is trying to kick Habré out.

Remember that Habré is America's man in the conflict. As we have seen, Habré makes Anastasio Somoza, the late former president of Nicaragua, look like Thomas Jefferson. Typically the moguls of the media here in the United States have told us next to nothing about the bestial activities of the man the Reagan Administration is supporting. I'll be back in a minute.

For a cassette tape of this week's broadcasts, please send \$7.50 to 725, Alta Loma, California, 91701. Ask for Tape 596. If you're in business and want to help sponsor these commentaries, call 714-980-3165.

This is Alan Stang. Think about it.



1984 - ONE MONTH AWAY

THE IRS COUNTS DOWN TO 1984

• **March 24, 1983.** The Internal Revenue Service announces it will use a new computerized phone system to dial-a-delinquent. Anyone with an overdue tax bill will begin receiving phone calls every 15 minutes until they answer, at which time an agent will come on the line to discuss his tax "problem".

• **May 24, 1983.** The Supreme Court rules that the IRS has "administrative authority" to deny tax-exempt status to private church schools whose beliefs are in conflict with "public policy," as defined by the government, and not by the people. This decision offers great latitude for further "administrative" decisions by the IRS about questions such as "what is a church?", "what beliefs are acceptable?", and "who is sincere?"

• **June 15, 1983.** The IRS begins hiring 4,000 new collection agents, despite personnel cutbacks in other departments, in an attempt to track delinquent taxpayers and confiscate their wealth, forcefully if necessary.

• **July 1, 1983.** New regulations, written by the IRS and passed quietly by Congress in the winter session, go into effect, requiring all stock, bond, commodity and bullion dealers to divulge the Social Security number and full financial information on each single transaction they make. This must be recorded on IRS form 1099 and reported on a timely basis to the IRS.

• **Sept. 15, 1983:** Several top marketing firms agree to provide their private mailing lists to the IRS, to help construct a "lifestyle profile" of most U.S. taxpayers.

These are just a few of the factors that provide an ominous countdown to the predictions of 1984. In addition to the growth of government power and size in the last half-century, there has been an increasing trend toward centralization of information about people, far beyond the prudent exercise of law enforcement and records.

Your 1040 form, for instance, not only describes your income, profession, family size, address, and so forth, but also intimate details, such as your church affiliation (for verification of charitable contributions), your medical problems, the age of your children, the location of your overseas and domestic bank account (by the coding on your check!). There isn't much the government does not know about you.

The Social Security Card, which says "not for identification" on it, has in effect become our identification number nationwide. The Social Security Number has become your driver's license number in 33 out of 50 states and your college identification number on most campuses. It's on your Army "dog tag". It's most likely your health plan number. It's on most library cards. And it's the key to voter registration.

Worst of all, your Social Security Number is the key to all federal information files on you, bank records, investment information, and personal secrets (think of all the information, for instance, which you put on a loan application or a job application — both of which are tied to your Social Security number).

As Paul Chitlik wrote in the *Los Angeles Times*, "There would be nothing about you — your likes and dislikes, goals and desires, intelligence and abilities, mental health, preferred reading, eye color and vi-

sion, religion and political beliefs, work and leisure routines, debts and duties, honors and punishments, vacations and escape, diet, dress, income, education, lovers and/or spouse, children, bad debts, and more likely than not, thumbprint — that couldn't be discovered by using that magical nine digit number".

Little Brother Grows Up

Minor inconveniences, once accepted dutifully, have a way of becoming severe intrusions of privacy, which, if patiently tolerated long enough, invite police state authority. If "Little Brother" grows up unruly, beyond his constituted limits, he has a way of gradually becoming Orwell's Big Brother. How "big" he becomes depends on us: Where will we draw the line?

Perhaps the analogy of a boiling frog is best. Put a frog in boiling water and he'll immediately scramble out. But if you put him in lukewarm water which gradually reaches a boiling point, he seldom tries to escape. Gradualism leads to tolerance, which leads to apathy, which (for the frog, and maybe for us) leads to a slow death.

Likewise, "Little Brother" grows up in small indistinct stages which are not visible day to day, but become apparent only over decades. Perhaps "1984" won't come until 1989 or 2011, or later, but it will certainly come upon any society that doesn't draw the line on its government: "This far, and no further."

The acts described above and those mentioned in Holzer's article are perfect examples of where prudent Americans may wish to draw the line on Big Brother. Either way, we will get the government we deserve.

Truancy dragnet in Fullerton

Students playing hooky face counseling, parents

By Teryl Zarnow
The Register

FULLERTON — At 11 a.m. Tuesday the 16-year-old girl was supposed to be in class at Fullerton Union High School. Fullerton police Sgt. Glenn Deveney spotted her three blocks from school walking in the opposite direction. She refused to give her name and insisted she carried no identification. When a backup officer asked her to check her wallet, she realized she had given him a glimpse of the marijuana joint tucked inside.

"You can't take me!" she screamed, shoving the officer off the curb and attempting to run across the street. "You can't do this!" Handcuffed, she escalated her abuse of the officer along with the volume of her screams.

When police at the station found a plastic bag full of marijuana inside her purse, they added possible narcotics charges to the truancy offense she faced.

By noon, 36 students aged 17 or younger who had played hooky were facing the wrath of their parents and a counseling session at school. A few, already on probation for crimes such as burglary, faced possible criminal charges.

All were caught in a truancy dragnet thrown by Fullerton and Garden Grove police in cooperation with the Fullerton high school and elementary school districts. Ten teams of police detectives and school officials in unmarked cars, crisscrossed the city, stopping youths to find out why they weren't in school.

The sweep was designed to keep kids in the classroom, to bolster state financial aid for schools paid on the basis of attendance, and to reduce daytime crime.

"We estimate about 60 percent of all daytime crime involves school-age youths," Fullerton Detective Cecil Reece said. The department has no statistics on youth crime, he said, but after two similar sweeps last year, crime in Fullerton decreased.

But some of the students stopped at the station waiting for their parents did not see the rationale.

Walter, 15, was picked up near Troy High School smoking a cigarette. When classes changed, he didn't know where to go, he said, so he decided to take a smoke.

There was no reason to bring



Fullerton police Sgt. Glenn Deveney radios his department to check the story of a suspected truant.

me to the police station," he said. "My dad is gonna kill me. This is just going to make kids mad." But his legs shook as he eyed the policemen in the room.

Randy, 15, a sophomore at Fullerton High School, agreed.

"It's not fair," he said, explaining that he was supposed to be excused from class but because of a mix-up his grandmother hadn't called. "This teaches some kids a lesson, but the people who really cut, it won't help. They'll do it anyway."

Debbie, 15, and Shelley, 16, said they lost their ride to Troy on Tuesday and decided to walk. When police picked them up, they were late.



By noon Tuesday, 36 Fullerton students aged 17 or younger faced counseling sessions at school and the wrath of their parents.

The Register

Lesson from

Giving Fullerton school officials benefit of a huge doubt, one might choose to believe Pupil Services Administrator Donald Hays' unintentionally hilarious explanation of this week's police roundup of truants.

Hays said, "Our major concern is to impress on our young people that they need to be in school ... in order to profit from the educational opportunities available to them."

In other words, this otherwise wholly inappropriate show of force and use of police tactics better suited to raids on organized crime -- eight teams of detectives raiding fast-food restaurants, malls and arcades to collar kids who ought to be in school -- is justifiable insofar as it teaches them a lesson?

Even if you buy the end-justifies-the-means reasoning here, or that some times you need to hit someone with a two-by-four to get their attention, you're still left with the question of just what lesson is being imparted.

The nominal lesson, of course, is that school is important, important enough to call out the troops to round up those who are insufficiently appreciative of "the educational opportunities available to them."

But even a child can't miss the deeper



Isn't it absolutely amazing that in this great land....the land of the free....the land of quality education....that we have to force our children to go to school. We do not have to discuss the real reasons....we know them all too well with the achievement levels going down and disciplinary problems increasing.

I was sickened when I saw the pictures and the story of the

Fullerton police department's raid. I couldn't believe it was actually happening in our country. I was relieved to see that THE REGISTER highlighted the main reason for the raid....THAT THE ONLY WAY OUR SCHOOL DISTRICTS GET PAID IS BY BODY COUNT. The raid was made for the sole purpose of getting the kids back in school so that the school district can count the bodies and get paid!

HOW WE HAVE BEEN EUNUCHED

The Dual Jurisdiction (Deceptions of the Black Robes)

We reformers and libertarians who wish to make government obey our laws and end our involuntary servitude have a problem. We do not understand how and why the Internal Revenue Service and the Federal Courts/Judges can disobey and ignore their law Title 26 U.S.C. and previous U.S. Supreme Court decisions. It is because we have two sets of jurisdiction in our U.S. Constitution:

- 1) Under Article I/VII with Amendments I/X - our "Organic Laws" and an unchangeable part of the U.S. Constitution.
- 2) Under Article III:2:1 - Maritime law of nations, and the non-positive laws, Amendments XI/XXVI - these are the flexible non-fixed portions called the "Federal" portion of the Constitution. We have been tricked into volunteering ourselves under this "Federal" Constitution!

In court, one is either under the Organic Laws and U.S. Constitution; or under the Federal Constitution and non-positive Maritime laws. Read the XI Amendment, which subjects one to the Federal Constitution, and note the words "Suit and Case" and ... "Shall not be construed..." Although Article III cannot be changed being a part of the original Constitution, people/citizens' status can be changed on a voluntary basis, thereby subjecting one to the Federal portion and the harsh Maritime laws of nations. How was this done?

- 1) By HRJ#192, 1933, changing our sovereign gold/silver money to fiat (wood) paper FRNs. We went into defacto Chapter XIII Bankruptcy to Private Federal Reserve Bank owners.
- 2) By joining (volunteering) Social Security Insurance, one gives the government jurisdiction under Maritime laws of nations, and becomes a cipher/fiat person. (See 42 U.S.C. 433(a), the 26 U.S.C. 3402(n)... now read §6305(b)... "No Court of the U.S. under Article I or III of the Constitution shall have jurisdiction of any action whether legal or Equitable,..." and also §6305(b) says there is NO (organic) law court under Article I while there is an Article III court under the Federal Constitutional Democracy. §6305(a) says that under §452(b) of the Social Security Act with respect to the individual, the "Secretary shall assess and collect... as if the amount were a tax..." So the 16th Amendment can only affect one when he is an artificial person. When one has a Social Security number and places it on the W-4 marked Exempt, he has given the government/IRS their Implied Assumpsit.

To be FREE you must effectively charge fraud and renounce/withdraw from the Social Security system with Maritime controls. It is your choice: To be a citizen without your inalienable rights in servitude; OR be a Sovereign Citizen (natural person) enjoying all the Organic Law safeguards under the U.S. Constitution, therein exempt from the Harsh Merchants/Maritime Laws.

Karl Marx said that they would bind us by invisible strings/shrouds? You can strike off the shackles of slavery and involuntary servitude and regain your Sovereign rights and Freedom.

For further information see Diogenes and contact California Inc, P.O. Box 41891, Sacramento, CA 95841.

CRIMINAL COMPLAINT

United States District Court		DISTRICT	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v.		DOCKET NO.	
		MAGISTRATE'S CASE NO.	
Complaint for violation of Title		United States Code §	
NAME OF JUDGE OR MAGISTRATE		OFFICIAL TITLE	LOCATION
DATE OF OFFENSE	PLACE OF OFFENSE	ADDRESS OF ACCUSED (if known)	
COMPLAINANT'S STATEMENT OF FACTS CONSTITUTING THE OFFENSE OR VIOLATION:			
BASIS OF COMPLAINANT'S CHARGE AGAINST THE ACCUSED:			
MATERIAL WITNESSES IN RELATION TO THIS CHARGE:			
Being duly sworn, I declare that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.		SIGNATURE OF COMPLAINANT (official title)	
		OFFICIAL TITLE	
Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence.			
SIGNATURE OF MAGISTRATE(1)			DATE

1) See Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure rules 3 and 54.

CALIFORNIA AT LAW INNS
-COURT RULES AND PROCEEDINGS-

AT LAW proceedings draw their authority from the U.S. Constitution in Articles I, III and VI, Amendments V, VI, VII, IX, X, XIV, and Common-Law that does not conflict with the U.S. Constitution. It protects the truth and punishes those who act unlawfully under color of law or administrative rule in adverse proceedings with the Constitution. It seeks to end litigation and protect the vigilant who assert and demand their rights - not those who sleep on them. It is the means by which the individual who has been damaged (and there must be Provable damage - after the fact) may seek redress lawfully from the Mighty, the Powerful, Agencies, Government and Franchised persons - those who hold special privileges. It will punish those who conspire to deny citizens their rights, freedom and properties as protected under the U.S. Constitution.

To discern cause for an AT LAW complaint, one must find an EXPLICIT or IMPLIED mandate violated in the U.S. Constitution. One must be damaged after the fact. If there is no mandate or damage after the fact, then there is no cause (jurisdiction) for AT LAW action. Example: Conspiracy, denied due process. There we have criminal charges. One would list all other unlawful acts done under color of law, or unlawful statutes and/or administrative regulations. These would also be listed in the complaint. All hirelings (civil servants) could be criminally and civilly liable and fined for the damages incurred that arise from AT LAW action. The Defendant in an AT LAW action can deny criminal jurisdiction by refusing to request a trial by jury; thereby limiting jurisdiction to civil liabilities. AT LAW proceedings offer a speedy trial. Delays, Motions, Depositions, and Interrogatories which delay the Equity and Criminal Courts' justice are not permitted AT LAW. Filing them by the Respondent/Defendant invites Summary Judgment. Attorneys, Judges, Government and Agencies are not permitted, for the proceedings prohibit the interference of Titles of Nobility/Special Privileges, and therein they must be acting Pro Se to be heard. (The Respondent enters counter-claims.) The perversion of U.S. law began when it was merged with Equity. Twisters of the truth used Equity as an excuse to ignore our laws. AT LAW is a remedy for the Sovereign to demand and obtain redress from injustices (unlawful acts).

1. Only the Sovereign hand of the individual citizen can speak Pro Se as a litigant(s)- no Attorneys, Judges or Franchise agencies - i.e., Government cannot be recognized, only an individual may be recognized.
2. Any Demandant/Plaintiff, or Respondent/Defendant, may seek advice but only their voice, or signed papers, are admissible for adjudication.
3. One can look to the Federal Rules of Procedure for the duties of the Clerk, Sheriff, Recorder, for the filing and servicing of Defendants, witnesses and evidence/records, Subpoenas, Summones, Judgments, Writs of Execution and Liens. There must have been damage to the Demandant and the pleadings must be with substance, defining the charges and sustained by the essential elements to the charges. There are no appeals to an AT LAW judgment by Default, Summary Default or Jury Trial conviction.
4. The Demandant/Plaintiff initiates the AT LAW proceedings by filing his/her Declaration with the Superior Court Clerk or the Federal Court Clerk. Generally, the State Court is the best option.
5. The Declaration/Complaint is the only pleading AT LAW. No Interrogatories, Depositions, Demurrers, Motions, or Stays are lawful and admissible for adjudication. The use of such results in Summary Judgment - at the option of the Demandant. The law (positive law) defines the crime and affixes the penalty. (Title 18, U.S.C.). Demandant must supply the material facts and exhibits attached to the Complaint which only identify the person who committed the crime. The act has been prejudged by the LAW and sentenced so judgment is rendered as a "Matter of LAW" (see Rules of civil procedure); therefore, a court clerk must sign, upon presentation of such, an order of entry.

Court Rules and Proceedings (cont.)
AT LAW CAL INNS

6. There must be a sworn affidavit attached attesting to the truth of the Declaration submitted with the filing of the Declaration.
7. Papers must be filed with the Superior Court Clerk or the Federal Court Clerk and the fee must be paid (or a statement of Pauporius must accompany the filing). The Clerk will accept, file and number the case and/or documents.
8. Service upon Defendants must be properly done in accordance with State Rules or Federal Rules (for Federally filed cases). The servicing must be at least as high as the Federal Rules, if they are more stringent than the State's. (That is, use the fairest method to assure no misunderstanding or claim of not receiving notification.
9. The Respondent/Defendant has at least 20 days (in some States), but not more than 30 days, to respond or a Default Judgment is incurred. You, the Demandant and the Clerk are the court for all further action until/unless the Respondent issues a Writ to the Clerk and Sheriff requesting a trial by jury and this Writ must have matters at law, and rules defined that answer all charges. The Writ must point to material facts, or points to be entered, in order to negate the charges and all essential elements. It is a counter-claim.
10. The Respondent's answer must not be Sham, and be without Demurrers, Motions, Interrogatories, etc., and an Attorney's filing for a Respondent is unlawful. Any of these will invite and authorize Summary Judgment before the 30 day period, but the Respondent may be found guilty of the civil charges only. If the Respondent invites Summary Judgment by a "SHAM" pleading with a request for a jury trial, the Demandant may decide not to file the Summary Judgment, and permit the jury to find him guilty of criminal charges. The Summary and Default Judgment entered in the court by the Demandant, executed and filed by the Clerk, can only enter the civil penalties.
11. Respondent/Defendant are served notice that if the charges are Truth, this AT LAW court is POSITIVE LAW and you must prove that the charges are false or you are guilty of the civil and criminal offenses. If you do not respond, you are only subject to the civil penalties. If the charges are proved false in jury trial, the Demandant/Plaintiff is subject to criminal penalties from the jury. The Demandant may forward the charges and information to the Grand Jury Foreman for investigation of the criminal charges when a Defendant denies criminal jurisdiction by avoiding a jury trial.
12. The County Sheriff calls the jury and no hirelings of the Government of any public agency may serve. Only "Freepersons" may serve on this sacred 12 person jury. The Jury judges the Respondent/Defendant and if found guilty, will sentence. There is no appeal from an AT LAW judgment, whether Default, Summary or Jury judgment (7th Amendment).
13. The jury trial proceedings make AT LAW work. The Respondent must assert in the counter-claim which must contain a claim upon which relief can be granted. After judgment, the Demandant prepares the papers and files the judgment and Writs of Execution with the Clerk. Liens are filed with the County Recorder(s). If found criminally guilty by jury, the Defendant would be jailed by the Sheriff per the jury's sentencing, including the jury's penalties in the judgment. The Sheriff must execute these lawful orders. Again, there is no appeal.

Court Rules and Proceedings (cont.)
AT LAW CAL INNS

14. All Clerk(s) and Recorder(s) are bound by their duties of office to perform Rules 55(b)1, 56(a), 57, 58, 64, 65 (les Pendes), 65 and 70 of civil procedure. All are bound to file promptly documents properly prepared in accordance with civil procedure, including criminal conviction by jury.
15. The Sheriff is bound by the Writs of Execution/orders to seize or garnish bank accounts, personal and real property, and hold sales of the Defendant's property(ies) to satisfy the lien(s), as ordered by judgment with the Clerk's signature, filed and delivered to him for action/disposition.
16. Individual(s), Titles of Nobility, Franchise Holders, Agencies (both public and private), City, County, State and Federal Employees (hirelings), are subject to AT LAW jurisdiction - even though their actions were done in accordance with administrative practice, code(s) (a hireling may perform his duties administratively correct under code) which are unlawful and executed under color of law, or State Constitution, are subject to AT LAW jurisdiction/proceedings, when these alleged wrongdoings are contrary to and in adverse proceedings with the U.S. Constitution. These violators may be charged in the State Superior Court or at the discretion of the Demandant. Federal Court and Government cannot interfere (Title of Nobility). Their Attorneys are barred (Title of Nobility). No judges (Title of Nobility), or Agencies (Title of Nobility) can have action transferred to another court or Equity jurisdiction. In fact, their attempt to do so may give the Demandant authority to enter a Summary judgment. Tolerance is best exercised here and one should await the 20-30 day period, thereby enticing the Defendant into a trial by jury for the criminal charges. It also invites the Title(s) of Nobility who enter the case to be added to the conspiracy charges in the case as additional "John Does", when discovered. (Co-conspirator(s), after the fact, if the Demandant so deems it.)
17. There are no immunities for violation of the EXPLICIT mandate of the U.S. Constitution and one must have overwhelming, extenuating, and mitigating circumstances verifiable and provable to flaunt and disobey the IMPLIED mandate of the U.S. Constitution as written and their intent as explained in the "Federalist Papers" (Ghost authored by Monroe, Jay and Hamilton).
18. The U.S. Constitution's higher law makes all lower laws, administrative edicts, regulations, legislated statute(s), the Legislator(s), and even the Executive who voted or signed the statute(s) into code for executive office holders or hirelings, Judges who disregard and flaunt through decisions, all subject to it's jurisdiction and justice. They all lose the shield of immunity passed by statute(s). These unlawful laws do not have jurisdiction over the Freeperson citizen(s) of this Republic. However, these "unlawful" laws may have jurisdiction over the hireling(s) of government and/or Franchise Holders.
19. Demandants/Plaintiffs who bring frivolous, and/or untruthful charges may be found guilty by the jury, if a truthful and proper counter-claim so proves, as there is only one Truth. All Freepersons are warned to only bring provable, lawful charges where you have been damaged into AT LAW proceedings. Wrong, improperly prepared, or untruthful charges, may bring severe penalties from a jury. Again, there must be damages to the Demandant (after the fact) of the offense.
20. The trial should be held in the chambers of the Superior Court and assigned by the Clerk. If the Bureaucrat(s) interfere, you may resort to Common-Law and hold the court elsewhere.

Court Rules and Proceedings (cont.)
AT LAW CAL INNS

21. Common-Law provisions are contained within AT LAW procedure in that those conditions not enumerated are reserved to the Sovereign citizen(s). This condition expresses the common-law, within AT LAW proceedings.

Your power stems from the U.S. Constitution and Common-Law, when not in conflict with the Constitution. Some are implied - such as the 9th and 10th Amendments. AT LAW proceedings protect the TRUTH, and punish those who act unlawfully under color of law or administrative rule. It restrains the hirelings and agencies of government(s) which deny our constitutional rights. AT LAW protects those who demand and assert these rights. It does not protect those who sleep on their rights. Study your U.S. Constitution. Take the inexpensive "Freeman's Institute" course. W. Cleon Skouson (Freeman's Institute, 3470 West 1987 South, Salt Lake City, UT 84104, (801) 973-1776) has devoted his life to this study and educating citizens to the truth, wonders and logic of this miracle of Divine inspiration which created the first free nation and gave it's people an abundance never before witnessed in history. We have strayed from the path of faith and prudence provided for us. Yea, we have been led astray by cultural distorters and twisters of the truth.

As Benjamin Franklin said, "It's a Republic, if you can keep it". He further said that to be free, people must be educated and understand the hows and the whys for all the prohabitation within the Constitution. Learn them, assert them rightfully and humbly, yet forcibly.

May your path to justice be lighted by the light from above, YAHWAH.

Researched and compiled by:

Roger Elvick and Cyril Stevenson, Jr.
California AT LAW INNS

AT LAW vis EQUITY LAW (TYRANNY)

A California Inns Essay on the Truth

AT LAW proceedings are a peaceful remedy to redress tyranny of the Government and their hirelings. It nullifies the unlawful deeds short of bloodshed lawfully. AT LAW enforces restrictions upon the Government and their hirelings, while preserving our rights and freedoms. The citizen is the Sovereign. If damaged after the fact in violation of a U.S. Constitutional mandate, a Sovereign citizen has cause and jurisdiction for AT LAW remedy.

Our Founding Fathers knew the danger and nature of government. They gave us a choice: we may proceed AT LAW or in Equity. AT LAW is positive law - it restricts the Government and their hirelings; while Equity's statutes and administrative law places restrictions upon the Sovereign citizen. Our Common-Law rights as guaranteed in the Constitution are being preempted by Equity's statutes, and mis-used by Hirelings and Judges. Our authority comes from Articles I, III, VI, and Amendments IV, V, VI, VII, IX, X and XIV.

In AT LAW (pure positive law), every statute that does not express the purpose of our Constitution and Common-Law in harmony with it, is NULL & VOID, the contrary notwithstanding (Article VI). If an item is more than \$20 (Amendment VII) it shall be decided by a jury trial of Freepersons (no hirelings). There must be NO appeal, nor judicial changing of penalties, nor re-examination (appeal) to higher court. Our Constitution is the Supreme Law (Article VI) and all so called judges are bound by it. It nullifies all statutes or administrative regulations, whether local, state or federal, not in harmony with the U.S. Constitution.

If the President is not above the law, then no Judge is and no hireling is; neither are protected from their unlawful deeds or rulings done under color of law. Has (if) the citizen been damaged by the ruling or deed? Can a legislature give their hirelings immunity? When hirelings/judges have jurisdiction as in Equity Court or when in performance of their duties - NO! The Constitution forbids titles of nobility. Is not a privilege of immunity just that? These judges/hirelings have sworn an oath to obey the U.S. Constitution. Not even with an amendment can we counter these Truths therein; for a fountain cannot rise above it's source. Unlawful statutes have given the illusion of elevating these judges and hirelings above us. They are all subject to AT LAW jurisdiction and justice, when they flaunt the Supreme Law by a ruling or deed. A ruling in adverse proceedings with the U.S. Constitution is a crime.

If a legislature passes a law not in harmony with the U.S. Constitution, are the state or federal legislators who voted for this contrary statute liable? YES - if the citizens have been damaged after the fact, but only by citizens within their district. It must be done when they return to the district. Remember, we are the Sovereigns, and AT LAW charges can be delivered against the wrong doer. How do we know what the intent of the implied constitutional mandates are? Study the Federalist Papers (by Monroe, Jay and Hamilton). Take the inexpensive Freedman Institute study course and learn your rights and heritage.


California AT LAW Inns
Cyril Stevenson, Jr. Roger Elvick

AT LAW FLOW CHART FOR PLEADINGS

SOVEREIGN) No Titles of
Pro Se) Nobility

TITLES OF) JUDGES
NOBILITY) ATTORNEYS

TITLES OF NOBILITY ARE
FORBIDDEN BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION



POSITIVE LAW is the only
legal evidence in court

COURT LAWFUL (Articles I, III,
VI, Amendments V, VI, VII, IX,
X, XIV) and Common-Law, not con-
flicting with the Constitution.

STATUTES ARE SUPREME
Constitution ignored

COURTS UNLAWFUL BY NO
PLEAS, NO JURISDICTION
(5th Amendment)

Court Clerk and Sheriff must perform civil process, until the Defendant properly enters court and presents issues by cross-complaint pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil procedure, via State rules, etc., to the Jury. Clerk and Sheriff must perform civil and criminal process, pursuant to the Jury's decree (judgement sentence).

CALIFORNIA AT LAW INNS

Cyril Stevenson, Jr.

Roger Elvick

Oct. 21, 1983

in jailhouse

being imparted, that the basis on which the public school system operates is wrong.

Police raids on the modern-day equivalent of the old fishing hole are only the tip of and perhaps most extreme, extension of the institutional premise of the public school system, which is that students must be forced against their will to stay for the schools while students are forced against their will to attend them.

School administrators learn the lesson every time they put together a budget. Rarely are they rewarded with money from the state for the achievements of their students but on the basis of attendance. So well they manage to get the students to school and keep them there.

On that basis, police raids are eminently efficient and supportive of the institutional premise.

Most of the lesson they impart to the children who were rounded up and jailed this week? How does it square with other lessons they're presumably imparting in the classroom, at home and at church: lessons about freedom and individuality, about respecting the rights and beliefs of others, about growing up in the land of the free?



A calling to Christians for civil disobedience

Theologian urges religious schools to resist government

By Roberts Green
The Register

The time has come for Christians to disobey the government, one of conservative Christendom's most respected theologians told more than 5,000 Christian school teachers in Anaheim on Thursday.

"If you teach in a Christian school, you're already on a collision course of not obeying the government," said Francis Schaeffer, whose most recent book, "A Christian Manifesto," has sold more than 325,000 copies.

"There isn't a Christian school in this country that doesn't stand against public policy in some way."

Most of the teachers gathered in the main arena of the Anaheim Convention Center listened with rapt attention, agreeing with every word Schaeffer said. Some of them had come to the teachers convention simply because Schaeffer was there.

"His writings have changed my life," said Ruth Bartel, a biology teacher at Whittier Christian Junior High School. "To come and hear him is a highlight of my life."

Schaeffer and his wife, Edith, are the main speakers at the Southern California Convention of the Association of Christian Schools International, a movement that represents more than 45,000 students in more than 1,400 schools nationwide, 150 of them in Orange County. The convention ends this afternoon.

The schools in the association banded together in 1978 to gain political strength, said Paul Kienel, executive director of the Whittier-based national organization.

Parents, especially Christian parents, feel that they have been alienated by the public school system," he said.

In 1978, both the U.S. Department of Labor and the Internal Revenue Service decided that Christian schools were not religious institutions and therefore subject to federal regulations.

Consequently, Kienel said, the Labor Department objects when a school fires a teacher over doctrinal differences. One teacher in Northern California is suing an association school for firing her for marrying a Jewish man.

The IRS now requires Christian school student bodies, faculties and boards, many of which are also church boards, to be racially balanced in order to receive tax exemptions.

The schools, Kienel said, see these actions as violations of their religious

freedom and are pushing a Religious Liberty Amendment in Congress to prohibit the IRS from withholding tax exemptions from Christian schools.

It is that type of government encroachment into church affairs that Schaeffer says Christians must resist. If a law is contrary to the law of God, he said, "the Christian has the duty to oppose the government."

Since the late 1960s, the Schaeffers — whose books have sold millions of copies — have been educating conservative Christians on the roots of this church-state confrontation.

As Schaeffer sees it, the confrontation is rooted in two opposing views of life. Either life is the result of a chain of chance happenings, or it is the creation of an all-powerful, timeless God.

What is at stake in that choice, he says, is the value of human life. If human life is only a chance happening, it has no value. If human beings are creatures of God, their value is measureless.

Public schools, Schaeffer says, are dominated by the chance view of life. Therefore, he says, their students are no longer taught absolute values. And, consequently, Christian parents have become so dissatisfied that they have been willing to spend the money to create Christian schools that do teach absolute values.

The issue at stake in public and private Christian schools, he told the teachers, is freedom of speech. In public schools, he said, Christians must fight to regain the right for students to pray on school property. In Christian schools, they must fight to retain the right to govern themselves as they see fit.

At the same time, he said, Christian schools must strive to educate students to make a positive difference in the world rather than simply to protect them from the dangers of a world alien to God.

"We ought to be teaching our students and the teachers themselves to be involved in the great issues of our times," he said.

For Schaeffer, those issues include not only public and private schools, but abortion, euthanasia, hunger and the peace movement.

"We must carry out our Christian value system," he said, "but at the same time we must be stirring up action."

For example, Schaeffer said Christians must take personal stands such as disobeying orders not to feed a deformed baby and therefore hasten its death. But at the same time, they must also protest such policies publicly.

Schaeffer and his friend, U.S. Surgeon General Everett Koop, started in a movie series against abortion, infanticide and euthanasia. Schaeffer also has appeared at anti-abortion rallies and picketed abortion clinics.

He has just collaborated on a book outlining what he sees as the dangers



"If you teach in a Christian school, you're already on a collision course of not obeying the government. There isn't a Christian school in this country that doesn't stand against public policy in some way. We must carry out our Christian value system, but at the same time we must be stirring up action."

Francis Schaeffer, Christian theologian

in the nuclear freeze campaign. There are two kinds of pacifists, Schaeffer said. The traditional peace-church variety that extend Christ's injunction to turn the other cheek to nations, and those who want peace simply because they don't want to be forced to take a stand on anything unless it impinges on their personal freedom.

Schaeffer, who is a friend of author and Soviet exile Alexander Solzhenitsyn, contends the Soviet system of government must be opposed because

it denies the existence of God and is therefore a threat to life on this planet. He believes that the Christian principle of loving your brother sometimes means using force to defend him.

For example, he said, in 1950 he and his wife were leading a Bible study in Dachau, the site of a Nazi concentration camp. There were Poles there, he said, who would have been killed had the American soldiers not arrived when they did, guns blazing. "Who loved their neighbor?" he asked.

What we do know is this....more and more of our families are either moving their children into private schools or, even at the risk of governmental action, keeping their children at home.

Christian schools are increasing, and the waiting lists are growing. This has caused a growing number of states to go after the private schools. The video tape of the FIRST PADLOCKING OF AN AMERICAN CHURCH shows how far this govern-

ment is willing to go to impose their humanistic ideals on our 'free' fellow citizens.

A recent conversation with Pastor Silevan indicated that the state of Nebraska is coming down heavy on many Christian schools of several denominations. The government can not afford to let this movement grow. And at long last the Christian community is going to stand up and be heard. Francis Schaeffer's comments must be heard by all!

ON LAW: THE BIBLE, TAXES & TRIBUTE

Jeremy Myer, one of the movements most eloquent voices and who possesses a truly brilliant way with words, is writing a new book. It will be called..... ON LAW...THE BIBLE, TAXES & TRIBUTE. Jeremy is going to explore what the Bible really says on taxes and tributes. Jeremy says that is has been written for TRUTH and, contrary to what most people believe, most people do not want the TRUTH.

A few of the subjects to be covered:

- * THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. THE OATH OF OFFICE. THE LIARS.
- * The Gordian knot of the 'land flowing with milk and honey'... our systems and people totally enmeshed in lies, debased money, perversion, and sleight of hand.
- * EVERYONE IS STEALING FROM EVERYONE ELSE....LAWYERS, UNIONS, POLITICIANS, SOCIAL SECURITY RECIPIENTS...BUT DOES THE MINISTRY TEACH: "THOU SHALT NOT STEAL", and what it really means??? Even the so-called 'GOOD' people are stealing!
- * THE ELEVEN COMMANDMENTS
- * RENDER UNTO CAESAR....

and much more....write for more details.

Jeremy has a special pre-publication price of 10 FRNS with discounts for larger orders. So order yours now....

write to Jeremy at P.O. Box 2700, Huntington Beach, CA., 92647.

Just a fairy tale (Isn't it?)

Not so long ago, in a faraway kingdom, there was a very pleasant town. Living in the town were very happy, industrious people who always insisted upon paying for their own lunches.

One day, somebody said, "In this town we now have an old person and a sick person who no longer can afford to pay for their lunch, so why do we not chip in and buy lunch for them?" Since all the town's people were real nice, that is exactly what they did.

Soon, a highly educated politician came to the town. He wanted — oh, so much — to become the mayor, so (recognizing the tremendous potential for getting votes) he smiled broadly and said, "Let us make a new law which will require everyone in town to chip in to pay for anyone's lunch who chooses to eat free."

And do you know what happened? A whole bunch of do-gooders said, "Oh, goody, goody, swell! Such a law would be peachy keen." So that is exactly what they did.

In a twinkling, the news spread far and wide that anyone wishing to eat free could do so in this town. In another twinkling, freeloaders from everywhere gathered in the town and the sound of gulping and chewing became really, really loud.

Well, as the chomping sounds increased, more and more of the contributors who had been paying for the meals decided to leave town and live where, once again, they would only have to pay for their own lunches.

Now after a time, it came to pass that there were only a few payers left in the town, but there were lots and lots of chewers and gulpers. And one day the mayor who started the whole thing said, "My oh me, goodness, we no longer have any money in the treasury! Who, oh who, will pay for all the free meals?"

"Not us," said the chewers and gulpers, "we are eaters. We most certainly are not payers. No, never, heavens!"


Seeing that there were now *no* payers left in town, the smart mayor said to the eaters, "Fear not, I will go to the king and tell him of our plight." And that is exactly what he did.

It so happened that the king had attended the very same school as the mayor and, consequently, he knew precisely what to do. He immediately issued a proclamation which required those thoughtless payers who had moved away to continue paying for the eaters' lunches, even though they no longer lived in the town with the eaters.

So the payers went on paying and the eaters went on eating, and everyone lived happily ever after. Isn't that a nice story?

(As this story was going to press, I received word that lots and lots of payers could no longer afford to be payers, so they were joining the ranks of the eaters. Neither the mayor nor king was available for comment.)

Raymond W. Mahony
Anaheim





LET'S START OUR OWN YELLOW PAGES

We want to find out if any of you are interested in starting a directory that would list what services you offer....if you would like to barter....or if you would like to be known to others in your area so that you can get together for meetings...tape sessions etc. We believe that we can have some fun with this. During our move we bartered for our shelving, our pictures, and others have bartered food for membership. **WE CAN, AND SHOULD, WORK FOR AND WITH EACH OTHER.**

Recently the Rampart Institute (a Libertarian organization) initiated their **FREE-MARKET YELLOW PAGES**...and it looks great. Just a smaller version of the telephone yellow pages. **AND WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE FREEDOM LEAGUE AND OTHER GROUPS JOIN TOGETHER AND DO THE SAME THING!**

There are many who would rather remain anonymous, and that is understandable. But for most of us, the opposition knows we are in the fight, and we should not be afraid, **BUT RATHER PROUD, to stand up and be counted.** We should be doing business with those who believe and act as we do....**DON'T YOU AGREE?**

We want to find out how many are interested before we proceed....so if you are interested, or if you have any suggestions....**PLEASE WRITE OR CALL to express your views.**

GROUP LEADERS....check with your members and see if they have any interest in a project like this. Many of us have members all over the country, **AND WE NEED TO GET IN TOUCH** not only from an information basis **BUT FROM A BUSINESS BASIS** as well. Over the years we may need to be able to rally resources from many areas, and now is the time to start towards this goal.

This publication will be entitled something like the Rampart Institute's so that there will not be any connotation of those listed as being part of a 'tax protest' group. We will not restrict listings....**WE JUST WANT TO HAVE LIKE MINDED INDIVIDUALS PARTICIPATE!!**

LET'S NOT WASTE TIME! DO SOMETHING CONSTRUCTIVE....TODAY! CALL OR WRITE WITH YOUR THOUGHTS AND SUGGESTIONS. LET US AT LEAST TRY TO UNITE ON THIS EFFORT!

R.A.S.C.A.L.

A NEW POLITICAL ACTION GROUP....GET ACTIVE!!

The attorney-activist-lecturer-television producer-organizer Woodrow Wilcox has recently announced the formation of a new political action group called **R.A.S.C.A.L.** (Rational Alliance Society for Constitutional American Liberty).

This organization will complement all existing organizations and will concentrate on building and **USING POLITICAL MUSCLE FOR PATRIOTISM!!**

R.A.S.C.A.L. meets **EVERY Monday evening at 7 PM** at **ROSALYNN'S RESTAURANT, 7402 Edinger Avenue (between Beach and Goldenwest) in Huntington Beach.** **JOIN IN AND HAVE FUN ORGANIZING A POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE!!**

'BIG BROTHER' AND. . . .

IRS plans to target self-employed

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Internal Revenue Service plans to test whether privately supplied computerized information about family living habits is reliable enough to help catch self-employed Americans who don't file a federal income tax return.

The aim of the experiment is to track down some of the non-filers who cheated the federal government out of an estimated \$3 billion in 1981 — a figure that tripled in eight years.

The information, which would be supplied to the IRS by private marketing firms that sell computerized lists to direct-mail companies, would include neighborhoods in which families live, how long they have lived there and the model car they drive.

"The idea is, we'll take a list of individual households and their estimated income and match it against a computerized list of all taxpayers," Walter E. Bergman, IRS deputy assistant commissioner for planning, finance and research, told the New York Times. "If the check suggests a family hasn't paid, we'll make an inquiry to find out why. This is no big deal."

However, Robert Ellis Smith, publisher of Privacy Journal, disagreed and called the IRS experi-

'We'll take a list of individual households and their estimated income and match it against a computerized list of all taxpayers.'

ment "very troublesome."

"While I am quite sure it does not violate the law, it graphically demonstrates the growing links between government and private computers. National lists of households and their incomes obviously are sufficiently accurate for soliciting business, but that doesn't mean they are precise enough to trigger investigations," he said.

An IRS spokesman emphasized the test would concentrate on people with self-employment income because the agency receives no information reports on such income, as it does on wages, interest, dividends and other types of earnings.

"Self-employment income is the largest single source of noncompliance by dollar amount," the spokesman added. "In order to have a more balanced compliance program, we need some way to verify self-employment income, and that is the purpose of the test."

Bergman listed several potential

problems with using the privately supplied data.

"First, the list of households provided by the private companies does not have Social Security numbers, so the matching with the tax returns will have to be done by name and address. This may not work," he said.

"Second, many households file more than one income tax return. Third, there sometimes is a difference between an individual's wealth and an individual's income that may cause problems."

"Finally," Bergman said, "it remains to be seen whether the estimated income figures are sufficiently accurate for our purposes and, if they are, whether the targeting results in a significant increase in our collections."

An IRS spokesman said there is a precedent for the agency's using privately supplied data. For 12 years, R.L. Polk & Co. of Detroit has been providing the IRS with car-registration records that the agency uses to enforce the highway use tax.

CHECK ON CHEATS

IRS computer test is a scary proposition

The computer age was just beginning when we were introduced to the injunction: Do not fold, spindle or mutilate.

How times change.

Like it or not, friends, you have been folded into the memory banks of computers.

Facts about your income, credit rating, possessions, lifestyle — you name it — have been spindled onto a computer's microchip.

And, in the process, your privacy has been mutilated. And the mutilation has just begun.

Buy a magazine subscription, register an automobile, open a charge account — conduct any of an array of transactions — and your name is gobbled up into a machine whether you like the idea or not. To make matters worse, chances are that machine will tell what it knows about you to other machines. And the other machines will try to sell you something — or worse.

The Internal Revenue Service, for instance, is about to test computers' abilities to find tax cheats. The IRS wants its computers to get in touch with the computers of private marketing companies to find out about Americans' lifestyles.

If the IRS computers find out from the private computers that you are living above your ostensible means, they will tattle on you.

Walter E. Bergman of the IRS explained the test. "The idea is: We'll take a list of individual households and their estimated income and match it against a computerized

list of all taxpayers," he said. "If the check suggests a family hasn't paid (taxes), we'll make an inquiry to find out why. This is no big deal."

There is little doubt that cheating on taxes is a problem. As a matter of fact, cheating on everything from bosses to spouses is rampant in this country if Dr. Hattie Liston, an associate professor of psychology at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, has her facts right.

She told the 91st annual American Psychological Association that "Cheating in America is epidemic... It is a moral dilemma."

Dr. Liston cited statistics contending that cheating on taxes costs the government more than an estimated \$100 billion a year.

The IRS, with its computers humming in the background, says tax cheating is growing, but it is more conservative in its figures than Dr. Liston. In 1981, the IRS estimated that unpaid corporate and individual taxes totaled \$81.5 billion.

If Dr. Liston's assessment of cheating in America is accurate, there is good reason to be alarmed. Cheating cannot be condoned.

Unlike the IRS's Bergman, however, we are inclined to believe that computerized detection of cheats is a big deal. It could be a raw deal. Somehow, as the computer age spreads and matures, it would be pleasing to believe that our privacy could be protected. But we aren't holding our breath.

Big Brother is already watching.

EDITORIAL

Silent Watchers

For several years, government agencies have been matching various computer files to identify persons improperly receiving government benefits. Although the practice probably violates the 1974 Privacy Act, it has continued with little public notice, partly because the targets have been low-income citizens, such as welfare recipients, whose rights are of little concern to most Americans. Now the matching is moving to the big time. The Internal Revenue Service will be testing a match program that checks up on every U.S. citizen and zeros in on affluent ones in particular (CW, Sept. 5).

The IRS, hungry for increased revenues, said it plans to test the feasibility of matching its files against commercial lists of U.S. residents, ordered by address and income. If the IRS master file does not contain the name and address of someone judged to have a high income, the agency will assume that person has failed to file a tax return and begin an investigation.

Put another way, while you sleep, the IRS will be surveilling your life-style. Do you own an expensive car? Do you live in an neighborhood of above-average wage earners? Based on this and other data, the IRS will be using a statistical profile to gauge your income and make enforcement decisions from the profiles. Some third-party list broker will make a subjective, unsubstantiated decision about your income, and the IRS will launch an investigation against you if its records do not correspond to that data.

Of course you will be given a chance to defend yourself, and that's just what it will be — a defense against charges brought by nameless third parties whom you have never seen or to whom you have never talked. You will be considered guilty until you prove yourself innocent, and the evidence against you will possibly be self-incriminating information you supplied to various agencies with no idea it would be used against you.

It is bad enough when buying a car, paying local property taxes and answering U.S. Department of the Census questionnaires lead to an avalanche of junk mail targeted your way by commercial mailing address brokers who collect data from such sources. But when that same action can lead to possible IRS investigation, something is seriously out of whack.

The IRS argues it is only using publicly available data. That may be true, but the availability of the data has no bearing on whether it is reasonable or legal to use it for criminal investigations. This is nothing more than high-tech rumor mongering. And the rumors have nothing to do with whether you have paid your taxes. No, the rumors have to do with the way you live.

In an age of surveillance, it is dangerous to stand out, even if it is just for having an expensive automobile. We can only hope the IRS plan is not a sign of things to come, of a time when conformity is the only safety from the silent watchers in government agencies.

Based on recent congressional actions to limit the surveillance and computer capabilities of the IRS, we can only assume this plan would not be approved if the IRS had to ask for the money to develop its own profile information and had to get access to Census and local and state tax records on its own rather than purchasing this information cheaply from commercial sources. We hope Congress will look carefully at this program to see whether it violates the privacy directives now governing IRS operations.



. . . . YOUR PRIVACY

Uncle Sam is eyeing your credit report

YOU AND YOUR CREDIT

PART

Two

The government and your credit report



This week, The Register examines consumer credit — how to get it, keep it, or win it back.

Wednesday, we'll reveal how the credit reporting system doesn't always work. Orange County residents will tell about their computer cross-ups — and how they solved them.

Thursday's feature is for consumers with a troubled credit history. We'll talk about how to re-establish credit and the free — and not so free — services available.

U.S. plans to purchase loan information from nation's credit bureaus

By Cathy Taylor
The Register

Guess who else is taking a peek at your credit report?

Uncle Sam. The federal government has joined the ranks of retailers and financial institutions who typically have studied your credit report to determine creditworthiness and make a lending decision.

A swelling number of loan delinquencies prompted the government to decide it no longer is going to play patsy to students, businessmen and farmers who default on government loans.

In just three years, delinquent debts owed the government rocketed 62 percent to \$41.1 billion at Sept. 30, 1982, from \$25.3 billion in 1979, according to the Office of Management and Budget.

This includes some \$27 billion in back taxes owed the Internal Revenue Service, \$3.4 billion in defaulted student loans owed the Department of Education, and \$2.2 billion owed the Small Business Administration.



Don Melton/The Register

To encourage defaulters to pay up, Congress passed a bill last year giving government lending agencies the go-ahead to report delinquent information to credit bureaus and, in turn, to purchase credit reports on prospective borrowers.

"Up until now, the government was separate from private industry," said Barry Baxter, spokesman for Associated Credit Bureaus, Houston-based

trade association for the 2,000-plus credit bureaus across the nation.

"The thinking was if these people knew bad information was going on their credit files, it would entice them to pay up," Baxter says. "The intent of the bill was to subject them (those who are delinquent) to the disciplines of the marketplace."

No agency is more keen on bringing

strict discipline to debt collection than the Internal Revenue Service, which accounts for the largest share of delinquencies.

"The Reagan administration is very strong on making every effort to collect delinquent accounts — that's one reason the IRS has received increased hiring," says Laura Myers, IRS spokeswoman in the local office.

EVER RECEIVE A RESPONSE FROM A POLITICIAN?

HERE IS A TYPICAL RESPONSE

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

HOUSE ADMINISTRATION
COMMITTEE

REPUBLICAN STUDY
COMMITTEE

REPUBLICAN POLICY
COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NATIONAL REPUBLICAN
CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

Congress of the United States House of Representatives

ROBERT E. BADHAM
40TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
2438 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-5611

DISTRICT OFFICE:
180 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 240
NEWPORT BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92660
(714) 644-4040

October 18, 1983

Mr. Patrick Detches
10342 Christmas Drive
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Dear Mr. Detches:

This is in response to your letter in further regard to your correspondence with the Internal Revenue Service.

Unfortunately, my staff does not have the technical expertise to assist you in matters such as this one which questions the constitutionality of the IRS and your individual designation as a taxpayer. They are willing and able to assist you should you have a problem with a specific revenue-ruling.


You may be sure that I am doing all I can in the House of Representatives to protect the individual rights of taxpayers. I also firmly believe that we must maintain a tax system which encourages savings and investment and does not overburden those who contribute the most to our national economy.

I appreciate your taking the time to write.

Cordially,


Robert E. Badham
Member of Congress

REB:lw



GO GET'UM, PAT

Pat is at it again....telling it like it is! You should be responding to your politicians in a similar manner. Let them know how you feel. We cannot let them get away with just letting the IRS tell us what is right....we have to let them know that our votes are going to mean something during the next election. They must know that you are an activist in some form or another....and letter writing, although time consuming and hardwork, can be beneficial. It should not be said that we didn't try every means available to us....It should not be said that we did not warn the politicians about our concerns.

One more important point....do you know what makes you a TAXPAYER? If not then write to the IRS and ask them to send you the proper information so that you can determine if you are a taxpayer or a non-taxpayer. Let's see what they send back. I have an idea by what has happened so far....and their response can be most helpful!

PATRICK A. DETCHES

PAD

Robert E. Badham, MC
2348 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

November 1, 1983

Dear Bob:

Your letter of October 18 regarding my correspondence with the Internal Revenue Service was an extreme disappointment to me.

You stated that your staff does not have the technical expertise to assist me in matters which questions the constitutionality of the IRS and my alleged designation as a "taxpayer". Then you have the temerity to say that they are willing and able to assist should I have a problem with a specific revenue-ruling.

What you have stated to me - as I view it - was that your staff doesn't know beans about the Constitution of the United States of America, yet has the ability to interpret the thousands of pages of the Internal Revenue Code and it's supporting regulations, rulings and tax-court decisions! Hell, man! There are IRS agents who cannot read the IRC properly! What makes you think your staff can?

I cannot be sure that you are doing all that you can to protect the individual rights of taxpayers. You denied that premise when, in the very next sentence of your letter, you said that "we must maintain a tax system which encourages savings and investment . . ." What if I do not want to save or invest? What if I choose to recirculate my money back into the economy? Is that not my right? If so, why should I be penalized by adverse tax systems "which encourages savings and investment"? Is this not government intervention into how I choose to live my life as a sovereign citizen of the United States? What the hell has this country come to? Fascism? Is this the most I can hope to expect from representative government?



Patrick A. Detches

THE B O E IS AT IT AGAIN MORE VIOLATIONS OF RIGHTS!!

RE: STATE OF CALIFORNIA - BOARD OF EQUALIZATION'S DISMISSAL OF PROTESTS

Recently the Board of Equalization started sending out Notices that they were dismissing an individual's appeal to the the Franchise Tax Board's Notice of Proposed Assessment. This is a continuing action by the BOE, and is a follow up to the previous letters sent out by Mr. Brenner.

We have prepared three different responses. We suggest you review each one and decide how you want to answer your Notice of Dismissal from the BOE. You might want to take bits and pieces of each of these responses and put your own answer together.

State of California

Board of Equalization

Memorandum

To Recipients of Dismissal Notices Date October 26, 1983
From Robert J. Brenner
Subject: The Dismissal and Possible Options

As we told you previously, our board's sole responsibility in processing appeals is the proper determination of liability, if any, under the California Personal Income Tax Law. Your failure to provide the information necessary for computing any such liability made it impossible for our Board to provide any meaningful review. Therefore, the appeal was dismissed. We still believe it is in your best interest for you to compute your own liability, and we hope that you will consider filing proper returns with the Franchise Tax Board immediately.

For your information, you can gain judicial review by filing a suit for refund in the superior court. Specifically, section 19082 of the Revenue and Taxation Code provides that any taxpayer claiming that the tax assessed against him is void in whole or in part may bring an action after payment of the tax and denial by the Franchise Tax Board of a claim for refund.

RJB:jm



Robert J. Brenner, Assistant Chief Counsel
State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 1799
Sacramento, California 95808

RE: MEMO RE DISMISSAL OF PROTEST

Mr. Brenner and all members of the Board of Equalization:

Your recent memo dismissing my protest to the Franchise Tax Board because you could not determine that I had any liability is most welcome. You state that "our board's sole responsibility in processing appeals is the proper determination of liability, if any, under the California Personal Income Tax Law". You then go on to state that you do not have "the information necessary for computing any such liability." Thank you for backing my stand that the Franchise Tax Board cannot show that I have any tax liability. I have contended this right from the beginning when I started my protest of the FTB's Notice of Proposed Assessment.

Several weeks ago you sent me a request for additional information and I submitted additional arguments and court decisions. Evidently these new arguments and positions were convincing enough for you that indeed I do not have any "taxable income".

I want to thank you again for stating that you could not determine that I had any liability for so-called income taxes. I will be able to use this determination against the FTB. If either you or the FTB feel that this determination is wrong than I presume you will then reinstate my request for a HEARING that I am supposed to receive.

Sincerely,

copies to all my state representatives

THIS IS ONLY ONE ANSWER TO THE BOE'S MOVE TO DISMISS. ANOTHER RESPONSE IS ON THE NEXT TWO PAGES. WE ALSO HAVE A THIRD WHICH IS FIVE PAGES LONG AND GOES A LITTLE BIT INTO A PHILOSOPHICAL DISCUSSION OF WHY WHAT IS HAPPENING IS HAPPENING. WRITE TO US FOR A COPY OF THIS THIRD LETTER.

RON

WE HAVE TWO NEW BOOKS:

RED BECKMAN'S NEWEST....	THE IRS AND THE BLACK ROBED COVER-UP	Ø5.00 MEMBERS
		Ø8.00 OTHERS
DONALD KIMBALL'S....	FREEDOM IS NOT FREE	Ø4.00 MEMBERS
		Ø7.00 OTHERS

Robert J. Brenner, Assistant Chief Counsel
State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 1799
Sacramento, California 95808

RE: MEMO RE DISMISSAL OF PROTEST

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTARY DATA SUBMITTAL. REQUEST PER SECTION 5025 OF
CALIFORNIA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, TITLE 18

Mr. Brenner and all members of the Board of Equalization:

The dismissal of my appeal is an affront to justice! You state that 'our board's sole responsibility in processing appeals is the proper determination of liability, if any, under the California Personal Income Tax Law'. You then go on to state that I have failed "to provide the information necessary for computing any such liability." Thank you for backing my stand that the Franchise Tax Board cannot show that I have any tax liability. I have contended this right from the beginning when I started my protest of the FTB's Notice of Proposed Assessment.

Several weeks ago you sent me a request for additional information and I submitted additional arguments and court decisions. Are you now saying that I did not submit the right information?...the information you wished to hear?...or that I did not submit any additional information? Is the Board of Equalization dismissing a Supreme Court decision contained in my supplement which clearly states, "A tax on income is not legally or economically a tax on it's source."? I am confused, but I know this...**you cannot deny me a hearing and due process!**

It is obvious that the BOE never reviewed, or even considered, my response to your request for additional information, or they would never have come to the conclusion that 10 pages of court decisions, including those of the Supreme Court, regarding 'income' definitions can be summarily dismissed or overlooked. For example:

REDFIELD v. FISHER (1930) 292 P. 813, 819;

"The individual, unlike the corporation, cannot be taxed for the mere privilege of existing. The corporation is an artificial entity which owes its existence and charter powers to the state; but the individual's right to live and own property are natural rights for the enjoyment of which an excise cannot be imposed."

Nor has the BOE addressed my five pages of rebuttal to the infamous "Dauberger" decision, or a three page letter to James Philbin of the FTB, or four court decisions ruling on the word "shall".

The BOE and the FTB have not even proven to me that I, a sovereign, free-born, unincorporated, unenfranchised citizen of the United



States, am **REQUIRED TO FILE!** I asked for such proof in the form of LAW, and to date I have not received a response. Is not the burden of proof on the accuser? Am I not proven innocent until proven guilty? Am I not entitled to due process?

While it is true that I may have voluntarily submitted to your demand for taxes which I did not owe in the past on what I thought was 'income', I am certainly not going to perpetuate that practice once I have discovered that I am not required to.

For you to state that I can gain judicial review only after I have paid the proposed assessment is blackmail!! Why should I be required to render to the state an amount that would equal the same in legal cost (or more) to get it back? Any attempt to confiscate same will result in an AT LAW action. While I am not disposed to such legal means, you may rest assured that I would initiate same if required to protect my property.

I hereby demand that this so-called DISMISSAL NOTICE be rescinded and that I be extended the opportunity to have my protest properly presented at a HEARING. And I further request that you be more specific in what information you want since I answered your last requests, but, evidently, not to your satisfaction. I also request that you acknowledge that I did indeed answer your previous letters and that I did furnish additional information, and did indeed supplement my original appeal. Do you need copies of these responses from me?

Sincerely,

copies to all my representatives in Sacramento

A FUN EVENING WITH DR. ACKERMAN

We had a most exciting and fun evening with Jerrold Ackerman, Ph.D. on November 15. We had the largest attendance for any of our meetings and no one was disappointed with the discoveries that were made. As a result of this first session on IS IT POSSIBLE TO FIND HAPPINESS DURING THE COLLAPSE OF WESTERN CIVILIZATION, we are planning to have a series of mini-seminars on the subjects of GETTING CONTROL OF YOUR LIFE; HOW TO CREATE OPPORTUNITY; HOW TO IMPROVE THE SATISFACTIONS AND REWARDS YOU GET FROM YOUR PERSONAL AS WELL AS YOUR PROFESSIONAL LIFE; HOW TO SELL AND MARKET YOURSELF; AND MUCH, MUCH MORE.

If you missed this first meeting and would like to see us have another introductory session....PLEASE CALL AND TELL US. We will try and schedule another one soon.

Our first mini-seminars won't start until January to give Dr. Ackerman time to plan and organize the overall program.

DECEMBER 'SPECIALS'

During the past few months we have scheduled a number of SPECIAL MEETINGS. In most cases these meetings/seminars/lectures/courses have had a fee above and beyond our normal contributions to the LEAGUE. We want to restate our LEAGUE's policy regarding these SPECIAL PROGRAMS.

In every case where we have had an additional charge it is due to the fact that the speaker has come from an area outside of Southern California. For us to be able to have these speakers appear we must guarantee their expenses and a reasonable fee for their time. We feel that it is in all of our interests to have these individuals speak with us.....so the bottom line is that we have to have a charge.

In some cases the LEAGUE has picked up some of the costs when enough was not received from those attending. We have attempted to keep the fees as low as possible so that we just meet expenses. It is not our policy to have these meetings as a way to raise funds....THAT IS NOT OUR DESIRE NOR POLICY.

We will continue to bring exciting speakers and subjects....AND WE WILL MAKE EVERY ATTEMPT TO KEEP THE FEES, IF NECESSARY, REASONABLE.

THIS MONTH THERE ARE SEVERAL 'SPECIAL MEETINGS/PROGRAMS'.

FIRST IS WOODROW WILCOX'S 'LEGAL RESEARCH' COURSE. Woodrow is an attorney, a TV producer and host, a political action committee organizer, and a very knowledgeable individual. He will be instructing individuals on how to do legal research. This is a three-evening course starting at 7:30 PM. The fee for the whole course is 100 FRNs (another attorney offered this course for 250 FRNS). ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED!

Woodrow is also offering to help individuals with TRIAL TECHNIQUES. These sessions will be on Saturday mornings and will have a fee of 15 FRNs. The first session will not be until the 17th since we have two other important meetings scheduled for the 3rd and the 10th.

John Pleasant will be with us on December 3rd to present COURTROOM PROCEDURES. THE SESSION WILL START AT 9:30 AM. THE FEE IS 125 FRNS FOR THOSE WHO DO NOT HAVE BOOK III FROM THE NATIONAL COMMODITY AND BARTER ASSOCIATION AND 85 FRNS FOR THOSE WHO DO. AGAIN, ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED! This is a most exciting and educational experience and required for anyone serious about being totally involved. John is a para-legal and was formerly on-staff with the NCBA in Denver, Colorado. John is now on his own and assisting patriots throughout the country.

On December 5 we will have Lee Brobst, an out-spoken advocate of proper jurisdiction arguments and top researcher in the field of maritime and admiralty law. This should be a very interesting evening. Lee comes from the State of Idaho, and has a very active group of patriots throughout the Northwest. Be sure to make this meeting.

On December 10, also at 9:30 AM, we will have Cyril Stevenson with us to present AT LAW. We have long awaited the time when Cyril could be with us. We have heard a lot about AT LAW, and now we will have the opportunity to hear from the man most involved in heading the drive to educate individuals about their legal rights and AT LAW. Cyril is a retired Marine Major and has an extensive political background and has been involved with the PATRIOT MOVEMENT since 1975. We are really looking forward to having Cyril with us. THE FEE IS 15 FRNS PER PERSON.....AND ADVANCED REGISTRATION IS REQUIRED.

DECEMBER SCHEDULE

MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
			1 LEGAL RESEARCH PART ONE WOODROW WILCOX ★	2 PROTECTING YOUR ASSETS PAT DETCHES	3 COURTROOM PROCEDURES JOHN PLEASANT 9:30 AM ★
5 JURISDICTION AND ADMIRALTY LAW LEE BROBST ★	6	7 →	8 LEGAL RESEARCH PART TWO WOODROW WILCOX ALSO Q & A WITH RON	9	10 AT LAW CYRIL STEVENSON 9:30 AM ★
12 PROTECTING YOUR ASSETS PAT DETCHES	13 FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS BOB HOLTZ AND JACK PROEFROCK	14	15 LEGAL RESEARCH PART THREE WOODROW WILCOX	16	17 TRIAL TECHNIQUES WOODROW WILCOX ★
19	20 LAW AND FREEDOM JEREMY MYER	21 VIDEO TAPE "THE FIRST PAD- LOCKING OF AN AMERICAN CHURCH"	22 THE MONEY STORY BOB HOLTZ AND JACK PROEFROCK	23	24
26	27	28	29	30	31

FREEDOM LEAGUE HEADQUARTERS

2140 W. Chapman, Suite 223 • Orange, CA 92668 • (714) 385-1776

THERE MAY BE FEES FOR "SPECIAL" MEETINGS
GUESTS WELCOME

ALL MEETINGS START AT 7:30 P.M. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED